

- 6 -

REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on November 16, 2005. Claims 1-4, 7-9 and 14-17 are presented below for examination. The Examiner has maintained the rejection of all the standing claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Further, the Examiner has rejected all of the standing claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Goodman/Chau (of record) in view of Eames et al., (U.S. 6,317,884, hereinafter Eames).

Regarding the 112 rejection, applicant amends the claims to overcome the rejection, and provides further argument that not only are the claims as amended more than adequately supported in applicant's disclosure, the limitations of the claims clearly differentiate over the combined prior art presented by the Examiner. For convenience, and as an aid in prosecution, applicant reproduces claim 1 as amended below.

Claim 1 as amended now recites:

1. (amended) A networking system for a home or business site, comprising:

a bridge adapter unit at the home or business site, having a first connection point for connecting to an external communication network and receiving public network protocol signals; and

a telephone wiring structure in the site, the wiring structure having multiple end points and one or more junctions, and connected at a single point to a second connection point of the bridge adapter unit;

characterized in that the bridge adapter unit operates the telephone wiring structure according to a Local Area Network (LAN) protocol, translates received public network protocol signals, to LAN protocol required by the telephone wiring structure, and modulates the signals in a manner to correct any signal variations at the end points

- 7 -

due to having multiple end points operated from a single point at the bridge adapter unit.

Applicant's claim 7 recites the method for practicing the invention in accordance with claim 1, and has been similarly amended.

Regarding the 112 rejection the Examiner has stated in his remarks that there can be found no description in the specification to support applicant's claims language of an inlet and outlet port, or that the telephone wiring structure is connected at a single point at the bridge adapter unit, or that the bridge adapter unit translates all received public network protocol signals, regardless of protocol.

Firstly, applicant agrees with the Examiner that there is no specific written description in the specification that the telephone wiring structure is connected at a single point at micro-PBX 301. However, applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that according to the Four Corners Rule, all subject matter in the claims, drawings and specification singularly may be counted as disclosure. Applicant's claim language is itself disclosure supporting connection of the telephone wiring structure at a single point, and operating the wiring structure from the single point. Further, applicant's Fig. 3 clearly illustrates that the telephone wiring structure is connected at a single point at micro-PBX 301, and as such, modulation of the signals in a manner to correct any signal variations at the end points due to having multiple end points operated from a single point at micro-PBX 301 is certainly inherent. Applicant therefore adds the claim language supporting the telephone wiring structure being connected at a single point to the bridge adapter unit, and modulates the signals in a manner to correct any signal variations at the end points due to having multiple end points operated from a single point at the bridge adapter unit, to overcome the Examiner's rejection of applicant's claims based on that premise. Applicant believes that the remaining items of the Examiner's 112 rejection are adequately overcome by claim amendments made herein.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of applicant's claims on their merits, Goodman fails to disclose specifics of a bridge adapter unit receiving public network protocol signals or driving a pre-existing telephone wiring structure according to LAN

- 8 -

protocol, or modulating signals to correct signal variations at the end points. Eames teaches a residential Gateway, but still fails to teach or suggest driving all incoming public network protocol signals, utilizing a single bridge adapter unit, over an internal network comprising but one type of wiring, such as a pre-existing telephone wiring of the building as taught in our invention.

Further, neither reference teaches or suggests that the telephone wiring structure is connected at a single point to the bridge adapter unit, and the signals are modulated in a manner to correct any signal variations at the end points due to having multiple end points operated from a single point at the bridge adapter unit, as in applicant's invention and claims.

Chau teaches an "ISDN Port Circuit and Protocol Converter" (Fig. 1, element 40), and does not teach translating protocols as claimed. The invention of Chau relates to communicating between endpoints in a telecommunications or computer sub-system. There is no teaching in Chau relating to "modulating the signals in a manner to correct signal variations at the end points due to having multiple end points operated from a single point at the bridge adapter unit" as claimed. Clearly, Chau teaches connections-rich sub-systems, and converting protocols, but teaches separate ISDN ports (20, 40) for each subsystem. Chau fails however, as do either of the remaining references, in teaching or suggesting that the telephone wiring structure is connected at a single point to the bridge adapter unit, and the signals are modulated in a manner to correct any signal variations at the end points due to having multiple end points operated from a single point at the bridge adapter unit.

Claim 1 is therefore clearly patentable as amended over the combined teachings of taken either singly or in combination. Claim 7 as amended, with essentially the same limitations as claim 1 as amended, is therefore also clearly patentable, and claims 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, and 14-17 are therefore patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims standing for examination as argued and above have been shown to be patentable over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time

- 9 -

extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dan Kikinis

By *Donald R. Boys*
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457